Rt. 7, Frederick, Md. 21701

12/2/67

Dear Rev. Cory,

Thanks for returning the extra copy of PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH.

I fear you are among the majority conned by Thompson. He does not at all explain what happened in Dealey Plaza that day, is grossly wrong-and necessarily so- and uses the Zapruder film only as a shill. He has added nothing but error and irresponsibility to what had earlier appeared. Even his head shot is not his. I published it in WHITEWASH II (221) and he was told about it by a west-coast associate of mine who discovered the same thing independently. His "calculations" are both wrong and the cheapest kind of flackery.

Superficially, it seems as though Thompson is in accord with what I have said. Actually, this is not the case. He has fixed on three assassins, knowing this could not be the case because he does not account for some of the shooting, for example the Tague missed shot and the Aldredge shot that I brought to light in WW II. He has Oswald the assassin bu having fired the first of the two head shots, says there was no conspiracy. In shot, he has evolved a merchanteble formula for getting the government off the hook. It can no longer insist the assassination was the work of one man. Its basic conclusions are that Oswald did it and that there was no conspiracy (it pretends it said otherwise on conspiracy). He agrees that Oswald did it and that there was no conspiracy. There were just two other guys who got the same idea and independently decided on the same time and place. Thus the government can thanks this "scholar" for showing them the only flaw-not a serious one, for it is consistent with what the government said- and agree that he is right. And thus we continue to be denied a solution to the crime.

In his public appearances, Thompson is careful to disassociate himself from the "critics". He also lectures the "critics", saying they "embarrass" themselves (how kind of him to show the error of our ways) by such thungs as the almost universal handling of 399, first in WHITEWASH. He merely misrepresents the unquestioned and unquestionable evidence on weight loss and then ignores what is already public knowledge, that there was a fragment in the governor's chest and one in his thigh. You will see more about this fragment when I can risk the added indebtedness to publish my fifth book, already written

I regret to say that if he didn't have a "cop out" commercialization of the assassination in the guise of scholarship, neither Geis nor the Post would have touched him. I have had my own dealings with both and know their attitudes only too well.

Sorry to disagree with you, but I cannot approve of either literary kleptomania or deliberate dishonesty on this subject. His book is potentially a very great hazard to the establishment of truth.

If there is one thing that should by now be beyond question, it is that no shot came from that sixth-floor window (for example, under Hughes, in PHOTO WW) and that Oswald shot no one. He says otherwise. I haven't seen the book yet, but all of those who disagree with the Report from whom I have heard are in accord with what I says, some being more bitter and worried.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg